



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D., 1916-17

ROBERT VINCENT CRAM.—*De Vicis Atticis.*

THERE are 127 Attic demes concerning the members of which something is known. The chief purpose of this dissertation has been to determine the relative importance of these demes between 508 and 30 B.C. The conclusion reached in this comparative study is that during the fifth century the men of the urban demes were the most influential in Athenian politics. In the fourth century the center of gravity shifted from the residents in the urban demes to the men of the shore, and there remained till the period of the Roman empire; in the last third of the third century, however, there was a great increase in the importance of the Mesogaia and a corresponding decrease in the city demes.

In the introduction, after a discussion of the nature of the material, the question is considered whether membership in a deme meant residence therein or merely registration in its official list. This question can not be answered with certainty, but there are several reasons for believing that the members enrolled in a deme actually resided there.

In Chapter I a brief consideration is given to the Athenian village communities in the "Middle Ages," their development, and the manner by which the synoikismos of Attica was effected. After a note on the Solonian naucraries, which in some measure played a part under the régime of Solon like that of the demes under Cleisthenes, the organization of the demes under the latter is described in detail and the significance of the changes he introduced is shown.

To make a comparative study of the demes, it was necessary to take all the names, the demotica of which are known, in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica*, Sundwall's *Nachträge*, and Plassart's list of the Delian gymnasiarchs published in 1912. The names thus taken are arranged chronologically, their family trees being determined where possible; all those that can be at all closely dated are assigned to that third of

the century in which their chief activities lay. Then the demes are arranged by trittyes according to the assignment of Milchoefer, Loeper, and Kirchner. The number of Athenians so arranged and compared is 12,640.

This comparison is made in two ways. Since the first method constitutes, in a manner, a proof of the second, the second is here explained first.

In Chapter III a comparison is made of all persons mentioned for any reason — political, religious, literary — in each third of a century, with the following categories omitted: women, men mentioned only as fathers, and persons whose names have been found only in sepulchral inscriptions. The results of this comparison prove the initial thesis that from the second third of the fourth century, if not earlier, until the time of the Roman empire, the Paralia was the most important section of Attica.

Since in such a comparison as this the element of chance enters to a greater or less extent into the preservation of the material, Chapter II is devoted to a substantiation of the results of Chapter III by a comparison from a different angle. A method of cross-sections, so to speak, is employed, and the following lists are compared:

1. Particularly famous men in each century who are not included in the following categories.
2. The generals of the fifth and fourth centuries.
3. The Athenian secretaries.
4. The more important boards of treasurers of the fifth and fourth centuries.
5. Citizens who performed any liturgy in the fourth century.
6. The diaitetai.
7. The prytaneis.
8. The ephebi.
9. The priests of Asklepios.
10. The priests of Serapis.
11. The Delian epimeletai and gymnasiarchs.
12. All Athenian citizens active on the island of Delos in the second and first centuries B. C.

The indications furnished by the lists in this cross-sectional study for the most part, especially in the case of the generals and the Athenians on Delos, substantiate the results reached by an examination of all the names collected in the *Prosopographia*. Melite, an urban deme, is best represented on the island of Delos; hence the conclusion that this deme was the principal seat of the mercantile and banking class in Attica at the end of the second century B.C. and the beginning of the first century. It is significant that the two demes next of

importance in the number of their representatives on Delos are Marathon and Myrrhinoutta, both situated on the east coast of Attica.

Finally, when the two new demes, Berenike and Apollonia, were created, they took the place of two old demes which now disappeared. These old demes were Pelekes and Hippotomadai.

WILLIAM C. GREENE.—*Quid de Poetis Plato censuerit.*

THE obvious inconsistencies in Plato's treatment of poetry, and the one-sided interpretations of his attitude put forward by modern writers, invite a new consideration of the "ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" of which he speaks. It is important, in particular, to discover the nature of the philosophy that is opposed to poetry, and to ask how far Plato really believed the opposition to be irreconcilable.

In the present dissertation, it is held that Plato's views are not capable of being schematized in quasi-mathematical form, but are rather the outcome of years of pondering, in which now one, now another phase of the problem held his interest; these phases, reflected in the several dialogues, are none the less evidences of a dogged attempt to reach a final doctrine, which, however, Plato was too wise ever to formulate exactly.

For Plato, the conception of "an ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" was no fiction. He realized that in earlier times poets had actually been condemned by philosophers, chiefly on the charge that their poems contained immoral elements. And traces of this charge are still to be found in Plato's own writings. But for him the problem lay even deeper; it involved the opposition of the world of sense and intuition to the world of thought and reason. Plato's greatest task in philosophy was the attempt to mediate between these worlds, notably by the hypothesis of ideas and by the criticism of this hypothesis. His treatment of poetry can be understood only when its development is observed in relation to the parallel development of the theory of ideas. It is, therefore, necessary to consider the conditions that led to the adoption of Plato's theory of knowledge, and to notice to what extent, in the several dialogues, he held perfect knowledge to be more

than an ideal of the imagination. For his view of poetry varied with his vacillating faith in the perfectibility of knowledge.

In the *Ion*, Plato weighs and rejects the ordinary notion of poetic inspiration, reserving for some later occasion a more adequate explanation of the value of poetry; here the poet's ignorance is contrasted merely with the knowledge of practical matters that is found in the expert. In the *Meno*, Plato hints at an absolute standard of truth; the poet is now, by contrast with him who has such a standard, placed on a level with the expert in practical affairs, but is not on that account condemned. In the *Symposium*, Plato sketches, as an ideal, the ultimate goal to which the lover of beauty, breaking away from sense and ascending by means of thought, should proceed; the works of actual poets are not here underestimated, except, of course, as they necessarily rank lower than the productions of the ideal activity that is to follow. In the *Phaedo*, Plato elaborates the distinction between sense and thought, but indicates the manner in which, by the use of the theory of ideas, the ascent may be made from sense to thought. In the early books of the *Republic*, because of an ethical interest, he restricts the province of poetry; but, far from depreciating it as imitative or as unable to deal with reality, he actually lays down principles by which it is to deal with reality. In the succeeding books of the *Republic*, he develops his hope of finding absolute knowledge by means of dialectic and the theory of ideas to such a point that, in the tenth book, for a moment he almost imagines himself to have attained it, and so spurns the poetry that clings to the world of sense. Here he resorts to methods that are hardly ingenuous, in order to contrast poetry as it exists with an ideal of philosophy. The very exaggeration of the argument suggests that Plato is here the special pleader, indulging in a dramatic gesture that is expressive of his conviction as a recent and ardent convert to philosophy, rather than of his considered and enduring attitude. In the *Phaedrus*, he returns to the problem of inspiration, relating it to the theory of ideas, and distinguishing the perfect experience of the ideal lover of beauty from the imperfect experience of the imitative poet; he shows clearly that the theory of ideas does not necessarily carry with itself a condemnation of poetry. In the *Laws*, he reopens in a more practical mood, the issues of the *Republic*, and waives the condemnation of poetry in favor

of a more temperate, though still an austere, acceptance of the art. Finally, scattered discussions in various dialogues give evidence of his attempts to explain how the arts can express universals in sensible forms.

In all these dialogues it appears that Plato was not setting down rigidly determined views, but was expressing the conflict between poetry and philosophy that raged in his own breast. Had he not himself been something like a poet, he could not have felt with such desperate seriousness the danger of poetry, or have resorted, in a rash moment, to the poet's gesture of exiling the poets; had he not been a philosopher, he could not have seen the heights to which poetry, regarded as an ideal, should climb. He did not, then, formulate a definite creed about the poetic faculty, and his special utterances are moulded by special interests. Accordingly, those interpreters are mistaken who attempt to make a sweeping generalization, — as that Plato condemned poetry, or that his real doctrine is contained in myths.

But in spite of all his inconsistencies, it is possible to see that Plato held during most of his career that thought and an understanding of life are possible only on the hypothesis that eternal forms exist, and that thought is ultimately an act of intuition which passes from the perception of particulars to these eternal forms. The absolute, for him, is both a principle of existence and a principle of goodness and beauty, and hence, in theory, can be approached either by a hypothetical science of dialectic or by the direct intuition of the lover of beauty. In practice, this goal is never attained, for both thought and aesthetic experience are corrupted by sense. Sensible objects and symbols may, however, put one in a way of approximating a vision of reality; and though the lover of beauty has to a certain degree a vision of reality, he can communicate this vision only by the imitation of it by means of sensible objects. If this imitation is regarded as true and valuable in itself, it is to be condemned; and since most contemporary poetry was content, Plato thought, to produce images without passing on to the ideal world, it was so far to be condemned. He recognized, however, that the poet might express eternal forms, and so far as he did so, he became a philosopher. In some such way Plato imagined that the "ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" might cease.

An appendix to this study summarizes the reasons for believing that the dialogues contain, in general, the views of Plato himself, rather than of Socrates, and in particular for holding that Plato was the author of the "theory of ideas."

CHARLES ROSS OWENS.—*Quo modo Tragici Graeci res naturales tractaverint.*

THE attitude of the Greeks and the Romans towards Nature has been treated in a general way by several writers of highest distinction, but the very fact that the treatment is of this general character has vitiated its value. We have been too ready to accept the ideas of Schiller and Humboldt and Ruskin and too little disposed to examine the evidence at our disposal, forgetting that it is very dangerous to include all Greeks or all Romans in one class. It is the individual we must look to and not to the whole state, nor yet to any group, however small, within the state. In the field of poetry, we must take into account the temperament of the poet and his outlook on life, his literary purposes, the merits or limitations of his technique—in a word, everything which distinguishes him from the mass of his fellows. Such is the task we have set ourselves in the study of the works of the three great tragedians. It is only through accuracy in the examination of the plays and an honest attempt to grasp the conscious or unconscious aesthetic and mechanical results that our conclusions can have value.

In the study made in the second chapter it is shown that the three poets are equally careful in making clear to us the scene of the play when the action takes place among natural surroundings. This was very important at a time when realistic stage scenery was yet unknown. Important, too, was it to make clear the time of the action, especially when for some particular effect, all or part of it took place by night. In many cases this exposition of time gives rise to poetry, beautiful in itself, but for the present, it is the mere mechanics of the play in which we are interested.

In the third chapter I deal with the more important problem of the aesthetic effects produced by descriptions of Nature. Each tragedian chooses from Nature such aspects as will harmonize with the spirit of

the whole play and intensify its impression on the minds of the audience. Descriptions are not merely introduced at a particular moment to heighten the emotions of the speaker by similarity or contrast, but rather, in many cases, Nature forms an apt accompaniment to the action and sentiment of the entire drama.

As the attitude of Euripides is especially important in understanding his plays and his relation to modern life, I devote the next two chapters almost exclusively to this poet. In the first of these I deal with his religious and philosophical conceptions in so far as they have a bearing on Nature. By examining other plays and fragments of plays, we can discover many of those ideas which have made the *Bacchae* seem a puzzle to many. There is really nothing in this play that is new or contradictory to the poet's earlier ideas; through this study of the religious attitude of Euripides towards Nature we can at least lessen the difficulties of the interpretation of this play. The *Hippolytus* and the *Ion* deserve special treatment in this discussion for they show the essential religious character of Euripides in his thoughts of Nature and of her powers.

As there has been a tendency to draw a hard and fast distinction between Classicism and Romanticism, I devote the fifth chapter to an attempt to discover the essential similarity of the ancient writers and modern Romanticists in the treatment of Nature. It is Euripides who comes nearest to the modern mind, and represents the transitional stage from the older poets to the modern. Although there are many similarities between Euripides' treatment and that of the Romanticists, there seems to be this one difference, that whereas the modern delights to set forth his own feelings in the presence of Nature, the characters in the plays of Euripides never do so.

The remainder of the study is taken up in showing in what ways the individual poets differ from each other in their treatment. Aeschylus shows a fondness for the unusual or the marvellous or even the grotesque in Nature. Sophocles is especially impressed by its spiritual rather than its physical aspect. Euripides shows the effects of his training as a painter, and, unless he is describing the intense quiet of Nature, he habitually sets forth a mental picture which we readily visualize.